

WELSH & KATZ, LTD

120 South Riverside Plaza, 22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-3913
Phone No. (312) 655-1500
Facsimile No. (312) 655-1501

RECEIVED**CENTRAL FAX CENTER****NOV 09 2005****FAX****To: Mail Stop Amendment
USPTO****From: L. Friedman, Esq.****Fax: (571) 273-8300****Pages: 6****Phone:****Date: November 9, 2005****RE: Serial No. 10/062,001****File: 7251-86120**☐ **Urgent**☐ **For Review**☐ **Please Comment**☐ **Please Reply****MESSAGE:**

Please see attached. Thank you.

**YOU SHOULD RECEIVE ALL PAGE(S), INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET. IF
YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL THE PAGES, PLEASE CALL (312) 655-1500.**

******* CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE *******

The documents accompanying this facsimile contain information which may be confidential or privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this information is without authorization and is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by collect telephone immediately so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the original documents at no cost to you.

PATENT
7251/86120RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 09 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Application of : Yaakov (Jordan) LEVY
Serial No. : 10/062,001
Filed : 1 February 2002
For : IMPROVED OSS
SIGNATURE SCHEME
Group Art Unit : 2131
Examiner : Matthew T. Henning

I hereby certify that this paper is being submitted
via Facsimile (571) 273-8300 to Mail Stop
Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box
1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on this
date of 9 November 2005

Barbara Balsano
Barbara Balsano

SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir or Madam:

This reply supplements the 8 November 2005 petition for extension of time and amendment submitted in reply to the Office Action mailed 13 July 2005 in connection with the captioned application. In the Remarks section of the 8 November 2005 reply, the remarks regarding the obviousness rejection included a paragraph near the bottom of page 9 regarding the relative word "close" as used in amended claim 1. That paragraph was confusing and a substitute paragraph in this supplemental reply clarifies appellant's argument.

For the Examiner's convenience, the entire Remarks section (substituting the corrected paragraph for the original confusing one) is included in this supplemental reply, and the Examiner is requested to consider these Supplemental Remarks instead of the original Remarks in connection with the Amendment submitted on 8 November 2005.